

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, March 2, 1967.

The House met at 2 p.m.

The CLERK: I have to announce that, because of illness, the Speaker will be unable to attend the House this day.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lawn) took the Chair and read prayers.

LICENSING BILL.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS

CITRUS ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE.

Mr. HALL: Recently elections were held to elect two producer members to the Citrus Organization Committee. I understand that, prior to those elections, a campaign was conducted about matters of policy. Therefore, it has become vital to the citrus industry that the wishes of the majority of citrus growers be implemented through the committee's decisions. Will the Minister of Agriculture say when he was notified of the new composition of the committee following the elections that closed on February 27, and whether the necessary action was taken at this morning's Executive Council meeting to have the new appointments gazetted?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: On Tuesday, when the member for Chaffey asked me a similar question, I told him that I had been informed over the telephone of the result of the election. The Assistant Returning Officer, who conducted the election, told me that he would have to transmit the results through the Returning Officer; therefore, I take it that the results will come to me through the Attorney-General. However, as yet I have not received this information.

Mr. Hall: You have not sighted it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No, and I have not had the official minute about it. This concerns me because of the present situation, but had I proceeded yesterday it would have been difficult for the information to have been printed in this week's *Government Gazette*. The usual procedure is that it is not necessary to go to Executive Council, but the appointments must be gazetted before the appointees take up their position. As there was nothing in the Act to guide me I followed the procedure

laid down for elections of the Potato Board. When I receive the information it will be sent to the Government Printer for insertion in next week's *Government Gazette* and, when this has been done, I shall notify the two successful candidates of their appointment.

Mr. HALL: In view of the apparently inefficient method by which results are to be translated into action following the recent election of two producer members to the Citrus Organization Committee, can the Minister assure the House that no decisions of policy or of any importance will be made by the committee before these two new members assume their places on that committee?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am not going to admit that there has been inefficiency on the part of the department. If anything the department did was inefficient, the same thing must have applied when the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) was elected to this House, for there was some delay regarding his taking his seat in this place. I do not think there should be any suggestion of inefficiency. Regarding any policy matters, I understand that the committee is today meeting with the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association, but I do not know what is being discussed, and I probably will not know until tomorrow.

RIVER PLANTINGS.

Mr. CURREN: Considerable alarm has been expressed by members of the grapegrowing industry in my district following the recent announcement that Tolley, Scott & Tolley Proprietary Limited intend to develop 1,000 acres of irrigated winegrapes near Waikerie. Can the Minister of Works say whether a water diversion licence has been issued in connection with this project and, if it has, what are the conditions of the licence? Also, what steps are being taken by his department to control future plantings?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member was good enough to inform me that he was going to ask this question and, therefore, I am able to supply him with the information he has requested. In connection with the water diversion licence, Tolley, Scott & Tolley Pty. Ltd. has been issued with a licence for water diversion that will enable them to water 400 acres of winegrape plantings. This licence was issued following discussions some 18 months ago between the company and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, at which time the rate of increase in plantings was such that no problem

in the supply of water was envisaged. However, considerable interest has been shown recently in increased plantings, to the extent that the Government has become concerned with the future availability of water for irrigation and for other purposes, covering a large area of the State.

The Government has, therefore, instituted an inter-departmental investigation to determine the extent to which water from the river can be further committed. This action has been taken to ensure that future plantings are kept within the likely availability of water in the foreseeable future. In the meantime extreme caution will be observed in the issue of any further permits. It is only through the control of diversion of water from the Murray River that the Government can exercise any influence on the extension of irrigated plantings outside Government-controlled irrigation areas, as the Government has no legal power to interfere with the rights of landholders concerning this aspect of land usage. It would not be proper for the Government to refuse to issue a licence to divert water on the sole ground of any likely effect on a particular industry.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture, in the hope of being able to clarify the Government's policy in regard to extensions in irrigation areas. I think the Minister may have the key to the problem. In the course of questions asked since the House resumed sitting, one reply from the Premier indicated that he was sponsoring extensions; another reply from the Minister of Irrigation expressed doubt about that, whilst yet another reply from the Minister of Works indicated that only a partial licence had been issued. As the Agriculture Department may have some knowledge of this matter, will the Minister explain the Government's policy on applications for bulk planting on irrigated blocks and say whether the Government specifically sponsored the undertaking that has been referred to in the House?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Agriculture Department has no control over this matter. As the Minister of Irrigation this week explained the position quite fully, I thought, and as the statement made by the Minister of Works today did not conflict with what the Minister of Irrigation said previously, I have no further comment to make.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Minister say what varieties of wine grapes are to be planted in the new area?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am not in the confidence of Tolley, Scott & Tolley Proprietary Limited.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain what varieties of grape Tolley, Scott & Tolley intends to plant on its holding? Does it intend to bring into viticultural production the entire holding of over 1,000 acres and, if it does, in what stages?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall try to find out what varieties of wine grape are to be planted but, here again, the firm concerned would need to give us this information. I shall take this matter up with the Agriculture Department. The other question is associated with the answers given last Tuesday by the Minister of Irrigation and again today by the Minister of Works. As has been pointed out today, the Government has no authority at the moment to prevent the company from planting grapes of any variety. This matter will be kept under review by the committee that has been appointed.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: There has also been acquisition of land at Paringa by an American company which, I understand, intends to plant citrus as well as grapes. Can the Minister of Works say whether the provisions he has referred to this afternoon regarding water would apply to this company in the planting of citrus in the Paringa area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am not aware of the situation, but I shall inquire and inform the honourable member later.

Mr. QUIRKE: My question once again concerns the areas to be planted adjacent to the Murray River. Although I am not critical of the plantings, I point out that irrigation in the area involves two problems: the first relates to the laying of water on to the land to be irrigated, which is a comparatively simple engineering problem; the second, however, relates to taking water off, which is a highly complicated problem. It is inevitable wherever large areas are irrigated that seepage will occur. We have not had an area in which it has not happened, and it is likely to happen in the area concerned. Can the Minister of Irrigation say whether the question of effluent drainage from the two areas involved has been examined in relation to the increasing salinity of our irrigation water supplies?

If the water has to be drained back into the river it will aggravate the problem; on the other hand, if it has to be taken elsewhere it will be a mighty costly proposition. If these

matters have not been examined by the responsible officers, will the Minister ensure that they will be examined in the interests of the settlers concerned?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the Minister of Works pointed out this afternoon, the only control that we, as a Government, have in the development of irrigated areas outside the Government irrigation areas is in the supply of water. It would not be reasonable for any Government to withhold capriciously a licence for the diversion of water if people applied for it. The only reason that we could advance would relate to the availability or the quality of the water. The question of salinity and seepage has not been considered by my department in this instance, because we could not prevent the areas from being developed if water was available. If a Government-irrigated area was nearby we would have to examine ways and means of negotiating with the company intending to develop the area to try to overcome problems that could arise.

In regard to Tolley, Scott & Tolley, my department has not considered the problems of seepage that could arise. I am not aware whether the other areas that have been mentioned (for instance, Paringa) have applied for a licence to divert water. The question of salinity and seepage has given the Minister of Agriculture and me much concern. As recently as the last fortnight the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Dunsford, Mr. Miller and I have conferred on this matter of the quality of water and the factors affecting it. I am convinced that to set up a committee in this State to examine the matter would not be sufficient to solve the problem. I believe that an approach should be made to the Commonwealth Government. We should have available the resources of the C.S.I.R.O. or some such organization to investigate this matter thoroughly and come up with a solution. This increasing problem is of particular concern to both the growers and the Government alike. I think that the Minister of Agriculture is in accord with my views on this matter.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Obviously the Premier's Department has been actively sponsoring this project. Indeed, the Premier said on television that he had given material assistance in respect of it. As the Premier's Department appears to be sorely at odds with other Ministers' departments (particularly with the Irrigation Department which should have been the controlling department in this matter), can the Minister

of Works, in the absence of the Premier, say whether he will take up the matter with the Premier's Department and ascertain whether there could be a better liaison between that department and the departments of other Ministers?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not accept the view that there is not complete understanding. The statement I made this afternoon in reply to the member for Chaffey was made with the concurrence of the Premier.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Although this question should be directed to the Attorney-General, perhaps the Minister of Works may, in the absence of the Attorney, be able to answer it. Can the Minister say whether Cabinet has appointed an additional stipendiary magistrate and, if it has, what is the name of the appointee? Also, will this appointment have any influence on the number of magistrates to be appointed under the Licensing Bill?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I understand that the temporary appointment of Mr. George Joseph has been made.

PORT PIRIE OVER-PASS.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, obtain a report from his colleague as to when work will commence on the over-pass at the Port Pirie and Solomontown railway junction crossing?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have not these facts today, but I will have them for the honourable member next Tuesday.

TAILEM BEND TO KEITH MAIN.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have advised the Minister of Works of certain questions to which I require answers concerning the Taillem Bend to Keith main, and I know that he has the answers for me. This scheme, which has been before the House for about four years, is one in which the Minister of Agriculture and I are greatly interested. The scheme is one of national development. It involves a large area which has tremendous potential but which cannot be exploited without water. There have been various programmes put forward relating to the construction of the Taillem Bend to Keith main, which has been commenced. Because I was alarmed to learn that work on the main was being curtailed (in fact, very little work is to be done in the next financial year), I ask the Minister now to let me have the answers to my questions.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

(1) The rate of construction of the Taillem Bend to Keith scheme has had to be slowed down, due to the limited funds available. This matter was referred to in the statements in the House on June 29, 1966, and July 6, 1966. Work has proceeded on the tanks and on preliminary work for the pumping station, in accordance with these statements.

(2) During 1967-68, it is intended that work will proceed on the construction of the main pumping station at Taillem Bend.

(3) It is expected that pipelaying will recommence in the financial year, 1969-70.

(4) It is expected that the trunk main will reach Keith and the township be supplied in the financial year 1970-71.

(5) Although preliminary designs for branch mains have been made, each branch main will be considered on its merits, by taking into account the direct and indirect revenue that will accrue from its construction.

(6) It is not expected that funds will be available for the construction of branch mains until the trunk main is completed to Keith. No branch mains are expected to be constructed within the next two years.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that the estimated cost of this trunk main is about \$8,000,000. According to Loan allocations (and I can use only those figures) about \$2,400,000 has been spent. Can the Minister of Works confirm the figures of the estimated cost of the scheme and the actual sum spent to date? Further, if \$2,400,000 has been spent, there will be a \$120,000 interest bill on the scheme (based on an annual rate of interest of 5 per cent). Can the Minister say how much revenue is currently being returned; how many properties have been connected; and whether it is intended to make further connections under the present arrangement?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will try to obtain a report on the matter.

FRUIT FLY.

Mr. HURST: The Agriculture Department has taken measures to strip fruit from trees in the Devon Park area, in order to prevent the spread of infestation by fruit fly. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government has considered compensating people who are having fruit stripped from their trees as a result of this outbreak?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The necessary legislation will have to be passed in this House, as is the normal procedure, and Cabinet last week gave authority for draft legislation to be prepared for this purpose. The procedure will be the same as it has been on every other occasion on which there has been an outbreak of fruit fly. Every consideration

is given. The normal practice is that the compensation relates to the price given on a wholesale basis, but there is an opportunity for people who are not satisfied with the sum they receive to appeal to a higher authority. Provision for this, of course, will be contained in the Bill when it is introduced.

Mr. Quirke: Do they consider the probability that they will be free of fruit fly next year?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This depends entirely on the individual. Some people do not even apply for compensation. It may be of interest to the House to know that the flat I occupy while I am in Adelaide is in the area where fruit fly has been found, and I shall not be applying for any compensation.

Mr. COUMBE: As much of the affected area is in Prospect, in my district, can the Minister say whether, subsequent to the spraying programme that was conducted by his department, any further outbreaks or infestations were discovered in the area?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am pleased to say that no other outbreak has been discovered and that it was only one isolated case restricted to one house property. The owner of the property correctly notified the department as soon as he discovered the infestation, following which all the fruit was taken from his garden and checks were made to see whether further infestations had occurred. Checks were also made for some distance from the property concerned, but no other infestation was discovered. All the fruit examined was entirely clean, and no other report of an outbreak was received. Residents have been informed that, if fruit has not been stripped, they are to notify the department immediately they suspect that fruit is infested. A circular drawing attention to this matter has been given to each resident concerned. Indeed, the honourable member has received one, as well as I, so we know the situation. Although no further outbreak has occurred, the position is being watched carefully.

WHEAT HARVEST.

Mr. RODDA: Last year when we were discussing the coming bounteous wheat harvest and when forecasters were hazarding certain guesses as to its extent, we talked about a wheat crop of 55,000,000 bushels. The Minister of Agriculture was going to unwind some of his magnanimity if the crop reached that target; if we did not reach it, certain other gentlemen were going to participate in this hidden

mystery. Can the Minister say what the final delivery figure of the current wheat harvest is likely to be?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Realizing the importance of this question and the issues that are at stake, I am rather sorry that I have to tell the honourable member that it may be four or five months before the official figure is available. I hope that people will not become too emotional on the subject in the meantime.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Growers haven't stopped delivering yet.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: True; in some places, particularly on Eyre Peninsula, the harvest has not been reaped, so it is a little difficult at this stage to say what the final figure will be. However, it would need to exceed 54,000,000 bushels to be a record. At this stage the harvest is expected to be very close to that figure. Regarding my magnanimity, I believe the honourable member will be catered for in any event.

HENLEY AND GRANGE SEWERAGE.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Late last year work commenced on the long awaited sewerage scheme for Henley and Grange, and naturally residents have taken a great deal of interest in the progress of work on this scheme. When the work commenced, the Minister of Works told me it was expected that some connections would be made in this area during this year. However, it has been said in the area recently that this is not likely. Can the Minister say what work has been done up to the present and whether connections are expected to be made to houses this year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It seems to me that two questions are involved. Regarding the first question, I have ascertained from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief that the 21in. diameter rising main from the pumping station in Cudmore Terrace to the Port Adelaide Treatment Works has now been completed. Construction of the 18in. and 15in. trunk sewers from this pumping station to the Henley Beach pumping station has now reached the corner of Atkin Street and East Terrace, a distance of 3,600ft. The balance of 1,000ft. left to complete this section should be finished early in March.

Regarding the second part of the question, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that progress is a little behind but it is expected that some connections will be given about June or July. These will not be able to be used probably until late 1967, as the delivery of pumps will be delayed until September or October; they will then have to be installed.

FLUORIDATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was interested in the comments in this morning's *Advertiser* attributed to the Minister of Works concerning the public demand for fluoridation in this State. The sum of the Minister's comments was that the Government would do something about fluoridation when there was a public demand for it. In view of the result of the Gallup polls conducted on this topic, can the Minister say how the Government intends to gauge the demand?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Unlike the honourable member, who seems to be attached to a minority group, the Government listens to the majority of the people and keeps its ear to the ground. That is how the Government assesses public opinion.

SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR.

Mrs. BYRNE: On August 10 (and on occasions previous to that) I asked a question of the Minister of Works, when I expressed the need for public toilet facilities at the South Para reservoir. Has the Minister anything to report on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Plans and estimates for this amenity have been completed, and I have pleasure in saying that I have approved an expenditure of \$9,650 to enable the project to proceed. It is intended that tenders will be called for part of the work and that the remainder of the work will be carried out departmentally.

HIGHWAYS BUILDING.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to the question I asked last year concerning the acquisition of property in Walkerville by the Highways Department for expansion of the Highways Department building?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports:

The department has recently purchased the land and house thereon previously owned by Mrs. Jenkins at the intersection of Walkerville Terrace and Victoria Terrace. It is proposed to acquire additional land in the vicinity of the building as soon as practicable to provide additional parking areas to replace that which will be occupied by the building extension and to provide for the future increase in the building population.

LAND ACQUISITION.

Mr. RYAN: The *Advertiser* yesterday published reports of the Public Works Standing Committee tabled in the House, one dealing with the building of a new technical college at Laurel Park, in my district. The *Advertiser*

also published criticism made by the Public Works Standing Committee, that some land had not been used for the purposes for which it was acquired, because other buildings had been erected. Can the Minister of Education say whether it is the policy of the department to acquire land and use it for purposes other than for which it was intended, thereby creating a charge against the State?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I think I can say it has never been the policy of the department to purchase land for one use and then use it for something else, thereby causing a charge on public revenue. I was interested in this report of the Public Works Committee and I had the matter examined, because I did not think that the committee's criticism was in accordance with fact. In examining the evidence submitted by Mr. Rooney (Acting Superintendent of Technical Schools), I noticed that the policy of the Education Department in regard to the acquisition of land was not referred to by him. I think the committee's criticism on both counts, in regard to both the change of site and the general policy of the department in regard to the acquisition of land for school purposes, is unjustified, and I intend to give my reasons, because I think the House should know more about this, particularly because the Auditor-General has commented on this aspect more than once.

I took no exception to the Public Works Committee dealing with this question, because I think section 28 (1) of the Act justifies the committee in commenting upon the department's land purchasing policy. However, the facts in regard to the Automotive Trade School, the Laurel Park Technical College, are as follows. On February 18, 1960, the Public Works Committee approved the building of a new Automotive Trade School on the present Frome Road site. Shortly after this approval, the department became aware that the hospital authorities were urging that this site should be made available to them for future additions to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It appeared to the department that, in order to provide the necessary space for expansion, it was almost inevitable the Government would decide that the hospital should be given first priority to the Frome Road site. We therefore looked for an alternative and purchased 4½ acres in Conyngham Street to the south of the Glenunga Oval. Almost at the same time the department purchased another five acres of land in Conyngham Street to the north of the Glenunga Oval, to provide a site for the building of a

new Adelaide Technical High School when it took over the control of the school from the Council of the South Australian Institute of Technology. In its report on this project in 1961, the Public Works Standing Committee strongly recommended that the southern site should be used for the new school because of certain advantages, and the department agreed to this recommendation. It was at first thought that 4½ acres would be sufficient for the school because of the proximity of the Glenunga Oval, but this is used by eight or nine other schools, and it soon became apparent that the department should release the five acres to the north of the oval to provide for much needed recreation space.

This latter action was possible because land purchased in 1961 at Laurel Park had become available as a site for the Automotive Trade School. This land had originally been acquired for a new Building and Furnishing Trade School which we were able to place in a standing building at Marlestone and which was ideally constructed for our purposes. Some necessary additional land has since been purchased at Laurel Park as recently as September, 1966, and December, 1966.

To sum up, the department was forced to change its plans to build the Automotive Trade School on the Frome Road site because of the urgent need of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The intention to build the school at Glenunga was changed in the first place on the strong recommendation of the Public Works Committee itself, and in the second place because extra recreation space for the Adelaide Technical High School was badly needed. The site at Laurel Park has been acquired over a period ranging from 1961 to 1966. In view of the rapid rate of development in the metropolitan area, it would be unreasonable to criticise the department even if all the land had been purchased as early as 1961 because of the difficulty of obtaining suitable land. In any case metropolitan prices have increased so rapidly it is quite likely that the land purchased in 1961 would now cost more than the original purchase price, plus interest.

Regarding planning land purchases, because of the continuing volume of land subdivision, the department has already appointed a Land Purchase Committee, comprised of senior professional officers and the Secretary of the department. A Senior Engineer of the Highways and Local Government Department and the Assistant Town Planner confer with the committee and are available to sit with it when it meets to review land developments and

to plan for future school sites. The department's land requirements are being planned many years ahead with the object of acquiring the land needed for schools at the least possible cost to the Government.

The Land Purchase Committee's objectives may be divided into two categories: First, there is the acquisition of school sites on land for which plans have been lodged with the Town Planner with a request for his approval to a subdivision. In these cases the committee is obliged to recommend immediate negotiations to purchase. At this stage, prior to approval for subdivision, prices are little above the broad acre figure, and certainly far lower than if the department were to wait until building commences. Secondly, in determining suitable sites for schools on land which, on the information available to the committee from the Town Planner and the Highways Department, will be developed in the future, the Land Purchase Committee assesses the department's future land requirements, identifies the land by quoting the section or allotment numbers to the Town Planner, the local government authorities, and the Highways and Local Government Department. No cost is involved at this stage but, immediately there is a move for development, the authorities named advise the Education Department, which is able to purchase the land at broad acre prices, perhaps a few years before the school can be built, but certainly at a total cost which saves the Government far more than any interest involved.

DRAINAGE.

Mr. QUIRKE: On Tuesday, the Minister of Irrigation answered my question about seepage and drainage at Loxton and other places in the soldier settlement areas. I referred particularly to a statement, made in a letter, that the Commonwealth Government found the full cost of drainage for those areas. Also, I asked for a report on the continuation of drainage work in these areas. Has the Minister that report?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have a substantial report for the honourable member. In August, 1964, when the committee was formed to co-ordinate the activities of departments directly associated with war service land settlement activities, block drainage known to be required was not only more than could be undertaken within a reasonable time with the physical resources then available but was increasing at a greater rate. As a first step to overcome the back lag of work, an

additional trenching machine was purchased in October, 1964, and tenders were called for the installation of 1,200 chains of drains within a 12-month period. This was unsuccessful because prices offered were completely **unacceptable**. The departmental drainage gang was re-organized and arrangements made for that work force to concentrate on block drainage installation, and, in January, 1965, officers from the co-ordinating committee together with a Commonwealth representative, made a study tour in New South Wales and Victoria to ascertain drainage practices and procedures in those States.

Information gained on that tour confirmed that the specifications for drainage installation in South Australia were equal and in some cases superior to interstate installation. However, they were more costly because of generally more difficult soil conditions, and a dearth of contractors and consequent lack of competition, together with the fact that in South Australia intermediate sumps were installed at five-chain intervals along lateral drains, whilst in other States settlers were contributing some of the labour requirements.

Recommendations from the co-ordinating committee to delete intermediate sumps and for settlers to be required to assist in clearing the drain route and the final backfilling and tidying up were accepted, as was a further recommendation on plant requirements. The department then increased the strength of its drainage gang and, with funds made available by the Commonwealth, purchased two additional back hoes in August, 1965. In addition, steps were taken to make more staff available for investigation into drainage required and the design of drainage layouts, notwithstanding considerable difficulty in recruiting suitably qualified personnel.

As a result of these steps, by June, 1966, the rate of installation was three times the rate which applied 12 months earlier, and the back-lag of urgently needed drainage had been largely overtaken. Furthermore, so far as drainage for which the Government authorities were then responsible was concerned, areas where the water table had not reached damaging proportions were being investigated and drainage designs prepared. Negotiations with the Commonwealth on an extension of the drainage assistance period were undertaken early in 1966, and by the end of May of that year agreement had been reached on extending assistance to June, 1972.

The Commonwealth provides the initial capital funds for these purposes, as has always

been the case and, although the State was not in strict terms of the agreement liable to contribute to the cost of drainage found to be necessary and installed after the expiration of the original drainage assistance period, it accepted the moral responsibility to do so in view of the circumstances involved. It will therefore share the cost (about \$750,000), with the Commonwealth as a development charge on the basis that this State will ultimately contribute two-fifths of the expenditure involved. It is therefore incorrect to infer that the Commonwealth bears the whole expense of this work.

Funds sufficient to meet the cost of drains in 1966-67 based on the rate of installation and costs experienced during the last three months of the 1965-66 financial year, were, in fact, sought from and provided by the Commonwealth in the 1966-67 Estimates. It was the fact that the extension of the drainage assistance period could not be anticipated, rather than lack of experience of the effect of increased installation, that affected the amount which was estimated for 1966-67. At that stage we did not know whether the extension period would be accepted.

The extension of the drainage assistance period could not be anticipated when estimates were prepared and approximately half the funds provided were allocated to repayable advances to settlers for drainage installation. In addition, as the extension of assistance was also retrospective to drains installed previously at the settler's expense, the funds provided were fairly heavily committed, especially in regard to the transfer of debits from settler's current account to development immediately the extension was approved whilst, for Loveday and Cooltong, total authorization of expenditure in development was over-committed.

For this reason a temporary slow down on installation and the submission of drainage proposals occurred over a three-week period in November, 1966, whilst Commonwealth approval to a re-allocation of funds for 1966-67 was negotiated. The present position is that, although sufficient funds were available to meet a commitment on additional drains to be installed this financial year, these are not sufficient to also meet reimbursement to settlers in respect to drains installed privately in the past, and Commonwealth approval for further funds for this purpose is awaited. State and Commonwealth authorities both aim to maintain a rate of installation which will complete all block drainage requirements well before June 30, 1972, if possible. The physical resources available at present are sufficient to

enable this to be done and it is expected that adequate financial provision will be forthcoming.

Drainage installed in December and January last was less than other months because of the Christmas to New Year break and since then some settlers have requested a deferment to minimize interruption to harvesting and summer irrigation programmes. In other States it is an accepted policy for drainage installation to cease entirely during the summer. Maximum rate of installation will be resumed no later than April this year and sooner if circumstances on the holdings involved will permit it.

RESEARCH GRANTS.

Mr. HUDSON: A report in the *Australian* of March 1, headed "Gorton puts blame on States for research cut", states:

The Federal Government has served notice that it will not reverse its decision on financing university research for the next three years. The Minister for Education, Senator Gorton, told Parliament yesterday: "The Commonwealth's increased contribution has been increased to the limit." He blamed the growing controversy on the New South Wales, Victorian and Tasmanian Governments. They had not only refused to match \$1 for \$1 the Commonwealth grant for post-graduate research, they proposed to reduce drastically over the next three years State grants made during the past three years. Academics claim that the decision by the Federal and State Governments means drastic curtailment of post-graduate research.

In view of this report, can the Minister of Education comment on the position in South Australia regarding the university research grants for the next three years, and say what the likely effect will be in South Australia on development and employment in post-graduate research fields?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Commonwealth Government has been rather unfairly criticized in the statements alleged to have been made by certain academics as published in the *Australian* recently, because, obviously, the Commonwealth has allocated a certain sum for research. I am not suggesting that it is adequate to meet the needs of research, but the Commonwealth made it clear a certain sum was available. In the first instance, the States were expected to find matching \$1 for \$1 grants for the Australian Universities Commission research grant for post-graduate work and for what is known as the Robertson committee research grant. Although this Government found it difficult to find the matching grants for the two purposes, it agreed to find

\$1 for \$1 for both these forms of research grant. At first, this State and Western Australia were the only States to agree to do this, as Victoria and New South Wales refused to find the matching grants. The Commonwealth Government proposed that if it found the full amount for the Robertson committee research grant the States could find all the research money for the Australian Universities Commission research grant.

At the 1966 meeting of the Australian Education Council, attended by all State Ministers of Education and by Senator Gorton, I strongly pressed the case for the Commonwealth to provide all money for the Robertson committee research grant without a matching grant from the States, on the ground that this was allotted to those universities where the Robertson committee considered research could best be carried out, not in accordance with population or number of graduates, and South Australia had a much heavier load to carry than had other States proportionate to the population and number of post-graduate students. When the other States refused to find the matching grant we approached the Commonwealth Government and said that, if we had to find half of each of these grants, we would not be in as favourable a position as that of the other States. Senator Gorton readily agreed that the Commonwealth would find the total of the Robertson committee research grant for South Australia, and would leave us to find the total amount, if we decided to do so, of the Australian Universities Commission research grant. This we decided to do. In South Australia, therefore, the research grants of both kinds will be fully met as originally planned.

ACCOUNTANCY COURSES.

Mr. BURDON: I understand that some difficulty has arisen for accountancy students studying in country areas, particularly those who wish to qualify for membership of the Australian Society of Accountants. I understand that a new accountancy course is available through the Institute of Commercial Studies, which I believe is a supporting course for the profession of accountancy. The Institute of Commercial Studies was formed recently, and the new course has been drawn up by the institute in conjunction with the Australian Society of Accountants. Can the Minister of Education say whether there is any reason why the Mount Gambier Technical College should not be granted permission to conduct lectures in accountancy diploma

subjects to the syllabus of the South Australian Institute of Technology, in order to enable country students to qualify for membership of the Australian Society of Accountants?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Government is anxious to enable country people to pursue these courses to the utmost, but where a student wishes to follow a diploma or degree course it is usual for him to come to the metropolitan area. Although it may be difficult for a student to pursue a diploma or degree course in the circumstances outlined by the honourable member, I shall be pleased to examine the matter thoroughly to see whether the course at Mount Gambier can be improved, even if not to the diploma and degree standard.

ROADSIDE NOTICE.

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads to the question I asked on November 15 about a roadside advertising sign?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads informs me that model by-laws I and XXVII of the Code of Model By-laws cover the erection of advertising signs. The sign referred to by the honourable member comes within the ambit of these by-laws, which empower a council to impose a licence fee of \$2. Model by-laws I and XXVII were originally made by the Government in 1936, but model by-law I was redrawn in 1950 and XXVII amended in the same year. These by-laws and others in the code may be adopted by councils, and the District Council of Stirling has adopted these by-laws.

SCHOOL ENROLMENTS.

Mr. CLARK: Can the Minister of Education inform the House of the increases in enrolments in primary and secondary schools for this year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I can give the preliminary figures, but the final figures are not yet available. The preliminary figures are as follows:

	Enrolments Feb., 1967.	Increase.
Secondary Schools		
High	41,311	2,320
Technical High	18,962	1,636
Area and Special		
Rural	4,925	446
Total	65,198	4,402

These enrolments are slightly above what had been estimated, the main increases being in the fourth and fifth years. The figures include secondary school enrolments in the Northern

Territory. In the primary school enrolments in all types of primary school, the total is 149,988; in the Northern Territory, 5,046; making a combined total of 155,034; whereas the combined total in February, 1966, was 150,019. The total increase in primary schools in South Australia and the Northern Territory is 5,015, and the total increase in all schools is 9,416. A more accurate return will be made available shortly.

VICTOR HARBOUR TRAIN.

Mr. McANANEY: Recently, a passenger on the Adelaide to Victor Harbour train wrote to the press saying that he had been dissatisfied with his trip to Victor Harbour, had thrown away his return train ticket, and had returned to Adelaide by bus. In view of the lack of support for this service, can the Minister representing the Minister of Transport state how many passengers were carried, and the revenue from passenger services, on this line last year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague and obtain a report.

RAINMAKING.

Mrs. STEELE: Last month, some members of Parliament, along with others, attended a most interesting lecture given by Dr. Bowen (Chief of the Rainmaking Division of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization). In the course of his lecture, Dr. Bowen made the point that the only experiments that had been conducted in South Australia had not been successful, but that later experiments in other States had shown that this was because the area in which the experiments in South Australia had been conducted were in the ranges east of St. Vincent Gulf, in an area south of Port Augusta which was too close to the sea-board. For this reason, cloud conditions suitable for seeding were absent.

However, in the Mallee district of Victoria, adjacent to the South Australian border, substantial success had been obtained, because the right kind of cloud had been present and the prevailing winds from the north-west to the south-east had been blowing over a land mass. In view of this, and in view of the fact that the Director of Agriculture, who was present at the lecture, has probably reported to the Minister of Agriculture, can the Minister say whether his department intends to arrange for the C.S.I.R.O. to conduct experiments in rainmaking in the North-East of this State?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter has been discussed at some length at the Agricultural Council from all States' points of view. According to the Department of Primary Industry, South Australia has the wrong type of cloud here at the moment in order to carry out rainmaking successfully. The warm cloud, as it is known in South Australia, is not suitable for the present type of cloud seeding, whereas in Victoria and New South Wales the clouds lend themselves to successful experiments. It is too early to assess the success of the experiments, because whether or not rain would have fallen had they not succeeded is in doubt.

The question of the type of cloud is under constant review in South Australia. In particular, the C.S.I.R.O. is studying the method of seeding to ascertain whether some other type of seeding material can be made available that will seed the type of cloud we have in this State. I assure the honourable member that the Minister of Agriculture keeps a constant watch on this matter, in co-operation with the C.S.I.R.O., and every six months this matter, together with the problems of all other States, is discussed by the Agricultural Council.

TEACHER TRAINING.

Mr. BROOMHILL: The Minister of Education is probably aware that there have been suggestions in recent weeks that the Education Department has not been training sufficient infants teachers. Can the Minister supply any information on this subject?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: There has been some criticism on this score, particularly in relation to schools in the Northern Territory. We are investigating that particular matter. The suggestion that the department has not been training sufficient infants teachers is incorrect. I am not suggesting that there are sufficient trained infants teachers. However, the number the department has been training has been steadily increasing, and special action has been taken to step up the number of trained teachers. Teachers of infants grades now in primary and infants schools have been trained in four main courses. These courses are as follows:

	Per cent.
"C" course—infants	53.8
"B" course—primary	11.4
"M" course—infants and lower primary	5.0
Special and Emergency—trained in schools	15.3
Other sources	14.5

Teachers in both primary and infants courses are trained to teach all grades from 1 to 7, but "C" course students specialize in infants work (grades 1 and 2) and "B" course students specialize in primary work (grades 3 to 7). Positive measures have been taken to increase the number of "C" course students and give increased training to "B" course students in infants-teaching methods.

I should like to say here that the present Government has taken special measures in this regard. For example, in order to obtain the number of trained teachers required for infants schools we have approved of the granting of equal pay for women by progressive steps over a five-year period. Women are no longer required to resign and seek re-employment on marriage, but are now transferred from the permanent to the temporary staff. Women students are now permitted to marry and remain at a teachers college. In 1966, "B" course students were afforded the opportunity of changing to a modified course containing more emphasis on infants training. Thirteen students took advantage of this. An increasing emphasis has been placed on the teaching of infants classes in the courses for all "B" course students. An expanded inservice training programme, including residential conferences for teachers of infants grades with "B" course training, has been implemented. The full inservice training programme of the Primary Branch has given a more than proportionate share to courses for infants teachers, particularly in infants method, child development, infants mathematics, and infants English. The loss of infants teachers to the service is higher, proportionately, than in any other section of the department. The reason for this is that so many infants teachers are young women who resign for marriage, family reasons, or for travel overseas.

In 1967 the allocation of exit students was based approximately on the enrolments in each type of school. For 1967, "C" course trained teachers were appointed to infants and non-infants schools in proportion to infants-grade enrolments. The average class size for grades 1 and 2 in the various types of school is as follows: infants, 30.8; primary without infants departments, 31.4; area, 28.9; and special rural, 22.2.

Inservice training for the teaching of the new mathematics curricula has been most comprehensive. Hand books, circulars and programmes have been distributed. Inservice courses and observation visits to pilot schools have been arranged for teachers in almost every

school, including schools in the Northern Territory. Further courses are planned for 1967. A teacher thoroughly conversant with mathematics curricula and teaching techniques has been appointed to assist each Inspector of Schools, including the Inspector of Northern Territory Schools. This teacher will visit schools under the direction of the Inspector to give inservice training in the teaching of mathematics. This is the first time such a scheme has been used.

PHYLLXERA BOARD.

Mr. HURST: Prior to the rising of the House before Christmas, Parliament passed a Bill to increase representation on the Phylloxera Board. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what has transpired since the passing of that legislation?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: In District No. 1, Mr. R. J. Ward of McLaren Vale was elected unopposed; in District No. 2, Mr. O. S. Semmler of Lyndoch was elected by ballot; in District No. 4, Mr. P. B. Arnold of Cobdogla was elected unopposed; and, in District No. 5, Mr. O. R. Thiele of Loxton was elected unopposed.

HIGHBURY ROAD.

Mrs. BYRNE: On November 9 I asked the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a question concerning the need for making safer the intersection of Valley and Lower North-East Roads, Highbury. Has the Minister of Lands yet received a reply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the Road Traffic Board has reported that an officer of the board recently investigated this intersection, and certain recommendations have been made to the Highways Department and to the District Council of Tea Tree Gully for improving the intersection. The board will keep the intersection under observation, following the implementation of these recommendations.

UNLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently the last of the prefabricated buildings was removed from the Unley Primary School, and I assure the Minister of Education that the school now enjoys a good playing area. However, as this area is undulating and not fully paved, will the Minister ascertain whether it might be paved and drained before winter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to have that matter examined. I do not know whether it is planned to undertake

such work on this particular area, but if it is not I point out that it will be extremely difficult to undertake any fresh work that we have not already estimated for the year.

SUCCESSION DUTIES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This question should appropriately go to the Treasurer, but as neither he nor the prospective Treasurer appears to be here I direct it to the Minister of Works. I desire to ask a question concerning the payment of succession duty on the estates of those killed on active service in Vietnam. The Minister may recall that Part IVA of the Succession Duties Act contains provisions for the remission of duty on estates of persons dying on active service but, unfortunately, they do not cover those killed in Vietnam. There was a provision in one of the Succession Duties Bills: in fact, I think in both of the Succession Duties Bills introduced into the House which, unfortunately, contained so many other matters that were quite unacceptable to the majority of members of Parliament that they were not passed.

Therefore, the position remains that there is no remission of duty on estates of servicemen killed in Vietnam. Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government intends (in spite of the policy of his Party on the question of troops in Vietnam) to introduce such legislation again either in this session or the next? If it is to be introduced in the next session can he say whether, as a matter of Executive discretion, if that is possible, duty in such cases will be remitted as though the law in force already extended to those killed in Vietnam?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Being neither the Treasurer nor the prospective Treasurer, according to the honourable member—

Mr. Millhouse: And many others!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member has been wrong before and is possibly wrong again. Although I have no knowledge of this matter being discussed in Cabinet, I shall nevertheless take it up with the Treasurer, and ask him to provide a reply next week.

NATIONAL PARKS COMMISSION.

Mr. McANANEY: I recently noticed in the press the appointment of three Commissioners to the National Parks Commission. Although I reflect in no way upon the members appointed, I was surprised to see that no official representative of the United Farmers and Graziers Association was included among the appointees,

although this association has five times more members than any other primary-producer organization in this State. I consider that a representative of that association would be extremely valuable to the commission. Will the Minister of Lands express his views on this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will be aware that during the debate on the National Parks Bill his colleagues tried to amend it to provide for representation of primary producers by three members. I said that, although this was desirable, I did not think it was desirable to amend the Bill in this form as it could give offence to other organizations that had an interest in the matter. Three primary producers were appointed to the commission. No undertaking had been given that any primary-producing organization would be represented: it was purely and simply that three primary producers would be appointed. I am rather surprised to learn that not one of these appointees (Messrs. Heaslip, McLaren and Smith) is a member of the United Farmers and Graziers Association.

Mr. McAnaney: I said there was no official representative.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That was not the intention, nor was an undertaking given that representatives of certain organizations would be appointed, because I did not want the Commissioners having to come back and answer to any organization or be instructed on what they were to do. People were picked not because of their affiliation with primary-producing organizations but because they were primary producers. As a result, these three Commissioners have been appointed.

EGGS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question relates to the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities tax. As one who pays the C.E.M.A. tax, I know it is a tax, not a levy. The Minister will recall that before the C.E.M.A. legislation was enacted, equalization charges were made by means of a per-dozen tax on eggs delivered to agents of the South Australian Egg Board. After the legislation became law the equalization fund was maintained by a bird tax. Under Commonwealth legislation, the maximum rate is \$1 a bird a year, and this figure has almost been reached. It was indicated in the press last week that the New South Wales Egg Board, unable to meet its commitments from its C.E.M.A. tax revenue, had announced that it was imposing, in addition to its C.E.M.A.

tax a levy of 1c a dozen eggs delivered to the New South Wales Egg Board. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the South Australian Egg Board can meet its commitments from its C.E.M.A. income, or whether it intends to levy a per-dozen tax in addition?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The South Australian Egg Board has not stated that it intends to make a levy other than the levies already imposed (I submit that the charges are levies, not taxes). I may have missed the honourable member's point about New South Wales, but it could be that we have a more efficient organization in this State.

MAINTENANCE DEPOTS.

Mrs. STEELE: In reply to a question I asked earlier this session about maintenance depots that could do maintenance work at schools, the Minister of Works said that the Government intended to set up depots (with offices) that could do these jobs. He kindly sent to me during the recess a list of the districts where these depots would operate. However, I do not know exactly where the sites are to be located. I imagine that, since then, the sites of the depots have been fixed for the various districts in which they will operate. Therefore, will the Minister obtain a report giving the exact location of the depots?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be pleased to try to obtain a report for the honourable member.

TEA TREE GULLY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Public Works Committee brought down a report on June 7, 1966, recommending the provision of a sewerage system for the Tea Tree Gully district. The ultimate proposals divided the area into four drainage areas, each a tributary valley of the Dry Creek and each with its own branch sewer. The proposal before the committee referred particularly to the provision of collecting sewers to serve the area known as Area No. 2 and all of the common effluent drains. As the Minister of Works is undoubtedly aware that the work has commenced, will he furnish me with an up-to-date report of the progress that has taken place?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

TREE REPLANTING.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Minister of Irrigation say how many trees have had to be taken out by settlers of the Loxton

war service land settlement scheme because of the rising water table? The Minister undoubtedly realizes that some time must elapse before the blocks can return to full production. Can he say also what assistance is being given to these settlers to replant the trees?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I do not have the information with me, I shall be pleased to obtain a report on the matter.

WINNS ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: By question in this House and by letter, I have taken up with the Minister of Roads the future of Winns Road, Blackwood, which leads down into Coromandel Valley. There have been persistent rumours that a large new arterial road is to take this route, destroying the beauty of the roadway as it now exists. Last December, the Minister of Roads told me that no plans had been made for this road and that, if there were to be a change, it would be so far in the future that it could not be defined at that stage. Since then, the rumours have persisted that a new roadway would pass along Winns Road and that a decision in the department would be made in February. Accordingly, I wrote to the Minister on February 17 presenting these facts to him and asking for information about the matter. I have not yet had an acknowledgment, let alone a reply, to that letter. As there is great perturbation in my district (and particularly in this part of my district) about the matter, will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, use his good offices with his colleague to secure this information for me?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am surprised to hear that the honourable member, learned in the law as he is, is concerned about a rumour, even a persistent rumour. However, I shall be pleased to see my colleague and to use my good offices (such as they are) with him to see whether I can obtain a reply for the honourable member.

BROKEN HILL ROAD.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, whether he would obtain information about progress being made on the construction of the road to Broken Hill and on that part of the Eyre Highway to Ceduna. Can he now tell me about the progress being made and about the expected date of completion of work on these roads?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that it is planned to complete

the bituminous surfacing of the Eyre Highway to Ceduna by 1967-68 and the road to Broken Hill during the same year.

STATE'S FINANCES.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Treasurer, a reply to my recent question about the State's finances?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The February, 1967, Financial Statement is as follows: There was a surplus on Consolidated Revenue Account in February, 1967, of \$690,000 as compared with a surplus in February, 1966, of \$1,017,000. The accumulated result for the eight months of the current financial year is a surplus of \$3,516,000 as compared with a surplus of \$4,823,000 at the same stage last year. In interpreting these figures it should be understood that after eight months the Treasury has received well over two-thirds of the annual water and land tax revenues, but has been called upon for less than two-thirds of interest and other debt services. The net deterioration of \$1,307,000 as compared with the first eight months of last financial year will, it is expected, be reversed during the next few months, so that the end of year result is likely to be rather better than the 1965-66 deficit of \$6,834,000, but not sufficiently to achieve the Budget estimate of a deficit of \$2,316,000.

A final deficit in the region of \$4,300,000 is expected from the most recent detailed re-estimates which have been made. This is a deterioration of about \$2,000,000 on the Budget estimate and is likely to arise after taking account of about \$500,000 saving on water pumping costs and an estimated increase in the Commonwealth grant of \$2,000,000. The deterioration in other items in the Consolidated Revenue Account as compared with the original Budget seems likely to comprise about \$2,500,000 increase in expenditures (including about \$1,300,000 in awards including the "interim" margins award, \$700,000 in Hospitals Department, \$300,000 in Education Department, and about \$120,000 in Social Welfare Department), and about \$2,000,000 shortfall in revenues (including about \$1,000,000 in railway revenues—mainly from general merchandise traffic, \$750,000 in stamp duties, \$150,000 in harbours, and \$100,000 in betting taxes).

On Loan Account, except upon public buildings, the expenditure is in line with estimates, but upon buildings an excess of the order of \$3,000,000 to \$3,500,000 is expected. This excess arises from rapid progress particularly upon hospital buildings and the Victoria Square building. The low level of activity in private

building has contributed to this probable excess. The indications are accordingly for a current deficit in 1966-67 on Loan Account of the order of \$750,000 instead of the Budget estimate of a surplus of \$2,321,000, which it was hoped would be available to offset the Budget estimate of a deficit of \$2,316,000 on Consolidated Revenue Account. On Loan and Revenue Accounts combined, accordingly, the outlook is for a total current deficit of about \$5,000,000 instead of the "break-even" planned in the Budgets presented to Parliament.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was, as I guess all other members were, alarmed and perturbed to hear the answer given by the Minister to the Leader of the Opposition about the financial outlook of the Government at present. In view of the most serious situation that has obviously arisen in this State, can the Minister say whether the Government has plans to deal with it, and, in particular, whether it will be necessary to call Parliament together for a special session before the end of the financial year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Provided that the honourable member can give an assurance that we can pass the Succession Duties Bill through the House if it is re-introduced—

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think that would be sufficient to make up the deficit?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: When I make statements I am certain of them, because I do not guess.

Mr. Millhouse: You are guessing if you say that.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No, I am not guessing at all: I am trying to answer the question.

Mr. Millhouse: It is a serious matter.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the member for Mitcham knows by now that he cannot keep up a running cross-fire while the Minister is replying to a question. The honourable member should pay him the courtesy of allowing him to answer the question.

Mr. Millhouse: I am sorry, Sir.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As far as I know, Parliament will not be called together before about the middle of June.

WATERVALE WATER SCHEME.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on Tuesday concerning the Watervale water scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As I stated in the House on November 17, 1966, the estimates of the cost and revenue return are being prepared, but there has been a delay in preparing the cost estimate because of the difficulty in obtaining information regarding the pumps that would be required because of the unusual widely fluctuating pressures in the Warren trunk main. The estimates will be completed as soon as possible to enable full consideration to be given to the proposal. If a satisfactory financial return can be obtained and the scheme given approval, it is expected that Loan funds would be available to enable work to commence during the 1967-68 financial year.

GUM TREES.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Minister of Agriculture will remember that some time ago he visited Loxton and representations were made to him about releasing water from a basin across the river to try to save certain gum trees. Can he say whether this has been done, and whether the salinity of the water has fallen sufficiently to achieve a successful solution?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: After I visited Loxton and inspected this basin, I issued instructions that every effort should be made to save the gum trees by getting rid of some of the water. The engineer, who accompanied me, suggested that this could be done by syphoning, and one and then another syphon was used for this purpose. However, a large quantity of water had to be disposed of. At that time a test showed the salinity in the river was greater than it was in the basin, so that it was safe to syphon the water from the basin into the river. At that time the salinity was high in the river, particularly at Waikerie. Some time after that I was relieved of some of my duties by the Minister of Lands, who became responsible for that area. As this is now under his jurisdiction I have no knowledge of the present situation, and that is as far as I can take the matter.

MARINO QUARRY.

Mr. HUDSON: In answer to my previous questions, the Minister of Mines has reported that officers of his department regard the dumps of material at the quarry as one of the main sources of the dust problem for surrounding residents. During the break between Parliamentary sittings I, together with local residents, visited the quarry. Further, I

observed what happened during weekends when the wind was from the south-east and would normally carry dust over Marino and Marino Rocks. From those visits it was clear that the dust problem caused by the quarry is largely caused by the operation of the crushers, and that the problem created by the dumps, while contributing to the nuisance, is virtually a minor one. As this information conflicts with the replies I have previously been given, will the Minister of Agriculture speak to his colleague about the information I have given in asking this question with a view to his discussing the whole matter with his officers to try to discover whether or not the department needs to vary its approach to Quarry Industries Limited in order to obtain suitable dust prevention measures at the quarry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

CHAIN OF PONDS SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department has plans to sewer the town of Chain of Ponds, particularly because of the proximity of this town to the Millbrook reservoir and the possibility of the danger of pollution?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As I am not sure of the facts, rather than guess I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

COUNTRY ABATTOIRS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government has considered establishing country abattoirs, whether any permits have been granted, and, if they have, to which towns?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: In Executive Council this morning the Governor's Deputy was pleased to sign a proclamation for permits to be issued to Murray Bridge and Peterborough as country abattoirs, and they will now be allowed, under the arrangement, to bring into the metropolitan area 50 per cent of their through-put or one-seventh of the meat sold in the metropolitan area, whichever is the lesser. Both of these companies have considerably increased their labour force since becoming export abattoirs, and each has been given a licence by the Department of Primary Industry to enable it to export. There is a trend today for boneless meat to be exported overseas, and both of these companies are exporting boneless meat in cartons. I have signed the permits and have posted them to the companies this morning.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to weights and measures and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides legislation which will enable the administration of weights and measures to be brought into line with modern developments in commerce and industry and with practices which have been accepted throughout the Commonwealth. The existing Weights and Measures Act was originally based on English legislation and, although it has been amended from time to time to provide for specific needs, it has become out-moded, with the introduction of new and more complex equipment and techniques in industry and commerce.

Recent legislation by the Commonwealth, which has entered the field of weights and measures in a substantial way, and by other States has rendered the South Australian Act unworkable in its present form. After examination of the existing Act and a study of corresponding legislation of the Commonwealth and other States, further amendment is considered impracticable, and action has been taken to draft a new Act and regulations to meet present-day conditions and to give control comparable with that exercised in other States.

The most important features of the new Bill are provision for any council to relinquish control over the administration of the Act in its area upon satisfying the Minister that such action is desirable; increased power for Inspectors to enter buildings and other places for the purpose of checking pre-packed stock; power to make regulations for control over appointment of Inspectors by councils; the registration and control of repairers and adjusters of weighing and measuring instruments; the registration of public weighbridges and weighmen; and inspection and stamping fees for petrol pumps and weighbridges, in lieu of licence fees. The fees proposed will return not less than the amount currently being received under licensing. South Australia is the only State with licence fees for these instruments.

The most important advantages to be expected from the new Bill are more effective and efficient inspection and control of weighing and measuring instruments, procedure for the protection both of the public and traders,

and uniformity of requirements and standards with other States and the Commonwealth, so far as is consistent with conditions in South Australia. Achievement of a high degree of uniformity will remove many anomalies and difficulties at present encountered by trade and industry.

South Australia and Victoria are the only two States of the Commonwealth where local government administration of weights and measures still operates. While this Bill does not propose the withdrawal of local government powers, except in the case of default or where sought by a council and approved by the Minister, it does provide for controls which should increase the efficiency of council administration. Experience has shown that the standard of efficiency and control varies very considerably among different councils. The effectiveness of control is entirely dependent on the ability and training of the local Inspectors, and some councils, particularly the smaller and more remote ones, are finding increasing difficulty in complying with the requirements of modern and more complex equipment. Before presenting this Bill the draft was submitted to representatives of local government authorities and of trade and commerce, in order that their views could be given full consideration. Some suggestions were put forward and have been incorporated in the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are machinery clauses usual in Bills of this nature. Clause 4 sets out the format of the Bill. Clause 5 provides definitions for the purposes of the Bill. Most are straightforward and do not need further explanation. I will, however, elaborate upon the definitions of "package", "sale" and "use for trade". Definition of the term "package" has been expanded from the existing Act to meet practices adopted by both industry and trade. The definition of the term "sale", whilst new to South Australia, is common to most other State Acts, and the extended meaning of the term to cover, offer or expose for sale, keep or have in possession for sale, is needed to meet the modern trend towards pre-packaging of goods. The definition "use for trade" is the most up-to-date meaning at present in legislative use. This extended meaning of the term is needed to cover all avenues of trade practices.

Clause 6 has been included in every Act passed since 1843 and its purpose is to provide uniformity of weights and measures throughout the State. Clause 7 re-enacts in this Bill clauses introduced into the existing

Act in March, 1966, and is a uniform clause throughout the whole of the Commonwealth. Clause 8 provides for the replacement of any standard lost or destroyed. Clauses 9, 10, 11 and 12 re-enact sections 36, 36 (a), 38 and 38 (a) respectively of the existing Act and place them in their correct order of sequence. These clauses are uniform throughout the Commonwealth. Clause 13 deals with appointments. Subclause (2) has been inserted to enable central administrative functions to continue in the absence of the Warden. Under the existing Act certain functions cannot be carried out until an Acting Warden has been appointed by the Governor. The clause also provides that the Deputy Warden, during his tenure of office as Acting Warden, shall have all the powers of the Warden (subclause (3)).

Clause 14 details the responsibilities of the central administration under this Bill. Subclause (2) (d) (ii) provides for the first time that those parts of the State, not within the bounds of any council district, shall come within the ambit of weights and measures, through the central administration. This extension is necessary to meet the increasing trade along the roads through these areas. The members of the public, whether local residents or travellers, carrying out trade practices should have the protection of this Act. Subclause (2) (d) (iii) provides for control of weights, measures and instruments used in various Government activities and the exercising of this control by the central administration.

Clause 15 provides for local government administration to the same extent as the existing Act. To enable two or more councils to utilize the same inspectors and standards, some sections of the Local Government Act dealing with joint undertakings are to apply. These provide Ministerial control over such schemes. The scope of local administration is detailed in clause 16. Clauses 17 and 18 deal with the appointment of Inspectors of Weights and Measures. In both England and Victoria, where there is council administration similar to South Australia, a council can only appoint as an inspector a person who has satisfied the equivalent of the Warden of Standards that he is competent to act. In these two places this calls for the applicant to have completed an appropriate training course and have successfully passed an examination. It is proposed in the regulations under this clause to give the Warden of Standards power to require persons to demonstrate their ability to satisfactorily

carry out the duties of an Inspector under the Act. It is proposed under existing circumstances to gradually introduce these requirements as trained officers become available.

Clause 19 provides that no Inspector shall derive profit from or be employed in the making, adjusting and repairing of weighing and measuring equipment and that he shall not receive any reward from any trader. It also provides that the Minister, at the request of the council, may authorize Inspectors to adjust scales and charge for such adjustment. The purpose of this provision is to allow a competent Inspector in an isolated area to carry out certain minor adjustments and thereby provide a service to traders. All charges made under this subsection are to be accounted for as the council directs. Clause 20 provides for secrecy of information obtained by Inspectors in the course of their duties. Clause 21 provides that an Inspector who commits a breach of the Act shall be guilty of an offence.

Clause 22 provides that if a council wishes to employ a person or private firm in an inspectorial capacity in lieu of a person employed by it under the Local Government Act, then that person or firm must provide two sureties. Clause 23 provides that every council shall provide such standards and equipment as the Minister directs. It further provides that the standards in force prior to the passing of this Act may remain in force subject to this clause. Clause 24 provides a penalty for councils failing to comply with the Minister's directions under clause 23. Clause 25 re-enacts section 43 of the existing Act. It provides that the Minister may direct any council to enforce the Weights and Measures Act, and, if that council fails to enforce the Act, the Minister may do so and recover all costs from the council.

Clause 26 re-enacts section 47 of the existing Act. It enables persons outside council areas to have their weights, measures and instruments checked by a council Inspector. Clause 27 re-enacts section 55 of the existing Act. Penalties have been appropriately increased. Clauses 28 and 29 are normal financial provisions. Clause 30 re-enacts section 57 (b) of the existing Act. It provides that where the administration by councils of a certain class of instrument or of an industry is either a matter of difficulty or one that creates undue expense, then the Governor may proclaim that the administration of that class of instrument or industry shall cease to be vested in the council and shall be transferred to the central administration.

Petrol pumps and weighbridges were proclaimed under this section about 30 years ago. Pharmaceutical weights and measures were proclaimed in 1965.

Clause 31 is new and provides that if a council fails to comply with a notice to enforce the Act (under clause 25) or where a council of its own volition satisfies the Minister that it is unable to administer the Act, then the Governor may proclaim that the administration of the Act in that area shall be vested in the central administration. Clause 32 defines the powers of Inspectors of Weights and Measures. Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) are similar to section 51 of the existing Act. Paragraphs (d), (e), (f) and (g) confer powers which are new to South Australia but which are common to all other State Acts and are necessary to give the Inspector power of entry to check pre-packed goods held or exposed for sale. Under paragraph (h) the Inspector will have power to check packages for deceptive marking. Paragraph (i) gives the Inspector power to seize and detain articles which contravene the Act. Paragraphs (d) to (i) are powers which are needed by Inspectors in this State to administer this Act and will be essential when the proposed uniform code for marking and standardization of packaged goods is introduced.

Clause 33 provides power for the Inspector to seize weighing instruments and measuring instruments which contravene the Act. This clause sets out in greater detail the power which Inspectors have under section 51 (1) (c) of the existing Act. Clause 34 provides that every instrument shall be marked with a stamp of verification. Clause 35 provides that every instrument be produced for inspection once in every two years. It further gives the Governor power to make regulations exempting certain instruments from being inspected or stamped; exempting instruments in certain parts of the State from the provisions of the Act; and providing for more frequent verifications on certain classes of instruments.

Clause 36 provides that if an Inspector finds instruments not stamped as required or incorrect or otherwise unjust he may either seize them or give to the owner a notice to repair same within 14 days or, if he is empowered by the Minister to adjust, make any necessary adjustments. Clause 37 was inserted in the existing Act in March, 1966, as subsections (5), (6) and (7) of section 26 of that Act. This clause gives the Commonwealth power to approve patterns of weighing and

measuring instruments. Clause 38 provides that the council Inspector shall visit each place of business at least once in every two years. That is the longest period allowed for re-verification. Inspectors should, however, visit the trader's premises much more frequently to check that instruments are in full view of the public and to see that the packaging requirements are being met.

Clause 39 provides, first, that no person shall use or have in his possession for use any instrument which is not stamped as prescribed and, secondly, that any instrument that is stamped in one council area subject to the Act shall be considered to be a legal instrument throughout the State unless found to be defective. Clause 40 forbids the use for trade any weight, measure, weighing instrument or measuring instrument which is unjust or has been mended or repaired, until the same has been restamped. It also provides that a person who mends or repairs such instrument shall obliterate any existing stamps on it. Clause 41 (1) deals with offences and is self-explanatory. Subclause (2) provides that any contract, etc., made in reference to any false weight, measure, weighing instrument or measuring instrument shall be void. Clause 42 provides that any person using a false instrument is guilty of an offence against the Act and such false instrument is liable to be forfeited. Clause 43 provides that, where applicable, the Government Inspector has the same powers as an Inspector.

Part V is not the Uniform Code for the marking and standardization of packaged goods. The Uniform Code has not, as yet, been completed, and the Ministers throughout the Commonwealth have agreed that no one State will introduce the code before a date to be mutually agreed upon. The purpose of this Part is to maintain the *status quo* regarding packages until the date for the implementation of the code. This Part also provides for the first time in South Australia that the sale of solid fuel shall be controlled by this Bill.

Clause 44 replaces section 18 of the existing Act and follows section 12 of the Commonwealth Act, which is more explicit in its meaning. Clause 45 re-enacts section 19 of the existing Act. It provides for the selling of articles by either avoirdupois or metric weight with the exception of gold, silver and precious stones, which may be sold by the ounce troy. Clause 46 re-enacts section 18 (a) of the existing Act and provides for the dual marking on packaged goods in both systems. Clause 47, with the

exception of subclause (1), re-enacts section 30 of the existing Act. Subclause (1) provides that all sales are to be made by net weight or measure. Clauses 48 to 50 re-enact sections 31, 32 and 33 of the existing Act. Clause 51 replaces sections 16 and 17 of the existing Act which have been in force since 1885. It provides for the sales of goods by dry measure using a schedule of weights permitted per bushel for the various commodities. Although a new requirement in South Australia, it is the practice in every other State.

Regarding clause 52, some council have been concerned with the glaring anomalies in the sale of solid fuel. Complaints investigated have on occasions shown that deliveries of supposedly one-ton loads of firewood have, on checking, shown substantial short weights. To remedy the situation clause 52 provides:

- (1) that unless the written consent of the purchaser is obtained, solid fuel must be sold by net weight;
- (2) that anyone who sells solid fuel by false description or wet solid fuel with intent to defraud, shall be guilty of an offence against the Act;
- (3) that any interested party or any Inspector shall have power to demand that the solid fuel be re-weighed in his presence; and
- (4) that this section is in addition to, and not in derogation of, any other section of this Act relating to the sale of articles.

Similar provisions exist in other States.

Clause 53 is self-explanatory. Clause 54, subclauses (1) to (4), are general offences provisions usual in this type of legislation. Subclause (5) provides that where a person is convicted and the court is satisfied that the offence was committed with intent to defraud then the court may impose a term of imprisonment not exceeding six months. This term may be either in addition to or in lieu of any other penalty. Subclause (6) gives a court power to order a defendant found guilty of an offence to pay to the person defrauded such compensation as the court thinks fit. Subclause (7) provides that in actions against a body corporate action may be taken against any person who is the manager or acts as the manager of the body corporate. Clause 55 re-enacts section 56 of the existing Act. In a prosecution for an offence against the Act in respect of any instrument, the onus of proof is to be on the defendant to show that the instrument was stamped as required. Clause

56 limits a person's liability for a second similar offence.

Clause 57 is an evidentiary provision, providing that unless evidence is given to the contrary no proof shall be required of the appointment of any officer under the Act. It further provides that any other document relating to or arising out of the administration of the Act is, if purporting to be signed by the Warden, to be received as evidence unless the contrary is shown. Clause 58 is a defence provision with regard to due diligence; clause 59 protects civil rights; and clause 60 gives the court power to award costs against the complainant if the complainant is not an Inspector and the complaint is withdrawn or dismissed. Clause 61 is self-explanatory, clause 62 providing that all fines and penalties shall be paid to either councils or general revenue of the State, as the case may be. Clause 63 is an evidentiary clause as to possession of an instrument for use for trade; and clause 64 provides for the forfeiture of instruments and/or goods which are in contravention of this Act.

Clause 65 provides that all goods so forfeited become the property of the council or the Crown, as the case may be, clause 66 providing for the recovery of fees in any court of competent jurisdiction. Clause 67 provides a general offence clause for obstruction, use of abusive language or assault against an Inspector or the impersonation of an Inspector. Clause 68 provides for regulation-making powers. Subclause (1), although new to South Australia, is a necessary provision. Subclauses (2) and (3) re-enact subsections i and ix of section 68 of the existing Act. Subclause (4) is new in South Australia and is self-explanatory. In respect of subclause (5), although this power is new to South Australia, it is one of the basic requirements to properly administer the Act. Subclause (6) replaces section 68 (12) of the present Act which has been re-drafted.

Subclauses (7) to (11) re-enact section 68 xii, iv, vi, x and xiii of the present Act with slight drafting modifications. Subclause (12) is new and may appear similar in part to the power of the Minister under clause 37 (2), but this is not so. This clause enables prohibition of the use of an instrument where such action is desirable. Regulations under subclause (12), while having a limiting effect on the use of instruments, will go further and prescribe that certain trades may have classes of weights, etc., prescribed specifically for their use, for example, dispensing scales used in pharmacies, and Class A Beam scales for weighing precious

stones. Subclause (13) is new and makes provision for prescribing the method of use of prescribed instruments. Subclauses (14), (15) and (16) re-enact subsections xi, ii and xiv of section 68 of the existing Act. Subclause (17) provides for the registration of public weighbridges and weighmen. At present any licensed weighbridge may be used as a public weighbridge whether the weighbridge is suitable or not, or whether the weighman knows how to weigh, or not. **Although an innovation in this State, it has a counterpart in every other State Act.** Subclause (18) complements subsection (17). Experience has shown that it is necessary.

Subclause (19) provides that the methods of taking tare weights may be regulated. Most of the anomalies at present existing in public weighing can be traced to either the inability of the weighman to weigh correctly which is covered by subsection (17) or the taking of stated tare weights. Subclause (20) is new to South Australia but is used in some other States. It gives the Governor power to prescribe the methods by which certain classes of goods may be sold. Subclause (21) re-enacts section 68 xva of the present Act. Subclause (22) re-enacts section 68 xvi of the present Act and provides in addition new powers to control certain methods of deceptive packaging, for example, over-size packages and certain meaningless discounts.

Both the 1963 English Act and the latest amendment to the Queensland Act place this responsibility upon weights and measures administration, as an Inspector of Weights and Measures is required to inspect the package. Subclause (23) complements subsection (22). Subclause (24) is a new requirement but one which experience has shown to be necessary for the proper administration of the Act. Subclauses (25), (26) and (27) re-enact subsections xv, xviii and xvii of section 68 of the existing Act respectively, except that increased maximum penalties are provided in conformity with present-day money values.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 28. Page 3280.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Many questions have been asked in the House about natural gas, and it has been the subject of public debate for a long time. In fact, I

think natural gas has been the subject of most of the Treasurer's speeches in the House, since he found the subject so enticing. I have been to a number of functions at which the Treasurer has raised the matter, and he has detailed at many gatherings the advantages of natural gas. However, I believe that emotions have run fairly high and, indeed, riot on this matter. A number of people (including the Treasurer at times) have over-estimated the possible advantages accruing to this State through the use of natural gas, according to the information available to the Government and to the public at the time.

My attitude (and that of members of the Opposition) has been stated frequently. The matter had its origins in the encouragement given by the previous Playford Government in regard to the exploration for petroleum products in this State. Indeed, we will do all we can to assist in bringing to South Australian industry and consumers generally gas at as cheap a price as possible, in order to make the venture effective in the short as well as in the long term. However, I must say that I believe that the Treasurer's refusal to make available information on natural gas investigations in South Australia is an affront to the Opposition and, indeed, to Parliament. Why has the Treasurer refused to reveal information in his possession?

I wrote to him on February 24 seeking information on the matter, so that we as an Opposition might prepare for this debate. I asked for all the Bechtel organization's unabridged reports that were available to the Government and for information on whether agreement had been reached for the sale of gas to the Electricity Trust, as well as for details of the financial arrangements recently agreed to in this matter in Canberra. Although the Treasurer could probably say that the last two matters had been answered in one way or another, either in his second reading explanation or in the Bill itself, he has nevertheless refused to provide Bechtel's detailed reports. In reply to my letter, the Treasurer said:

Concerning the Bechtel report, it is not the intention of the Government to make this report available, as I have given the main features of that report in my presentation of the case on behalf of South Australia and in the other information that has been given to the House on a number of occasions.

Apparently, we in this place, as well as the public, are to be satisfied with the main features and will not receive the details.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: When millions of dollars is at stake!

Mr. HALL: It has been suggested that about \$35,000,000 is at stake, but we are apparently to rely on a verbal agreement. When \$20,000,000 is to be raised in South Australia (a sum that no doubt could be invested in other ways) and when we are dealing with such highly financial considerations, we apparently must be content with the main features.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: As retailed to us!

Mr. HALL: Yes. Why should the Treasurer deny this information to the Opposition and to the public? Have his own members got this information? We do not know. We have offered our co-operation, and we stand on record as supporting these moves. Why is this information denied to us, especially when there appears to be only one group supplying gas and only two main consumers, neither of which are acting in competition with one another. We on this side resent this information being denied to us. Our task is made all the harder when we cannot get behind the fog the Treasurer has put up about this matter. Half-truths and wrong statements about natural gas have been made in South Australia. All members of the State Parliament have learnt the history of natural gas from the very useful leaflet on this subject prepared by the Mines Department. The pamphlet states:

Oil exploration in the previously unknown central portion of the basin was commenced by the Delhi-Santos group in 1957. The work comprised surface geological investigation and extensive airborne magnetometer, and both reflection and refraction seismic surveys. Drilling followed on several of the structures delineated by this work, eight dry holes having been drilled in the north-eastern corner of South Australia and in adjoining tenements held by the two companies in Queensland prior to the discovery of natural gas at Gidgealpa in 1963. These eight dry holes totalled 77,196ft. of drilling, and the information obtained from them greatly increased the knowledge of the geological history of the area and led to the discovery of the Gidgealpa field. Subsequent drilling at Gidgealpa resulted in significant gas flows from five of the seven wells drilled, with an aggregate flow rate of 59.5MMcf/d. Two holes drilled nearby at Moomba were subsequently successful as natural gas producers . . .

The exploration which has gone on from 1957 has resulted in the findings of the fields as we know them today. Before we go into the details of what we have got, it would be good to ask what South Australia's requirements will be in regard to natural gas. We obviously need an unlimited supply of gas for

fuel supplies, for the Electricity Trust of South Australia, the South Australian Gas Company, and industries, particularly those that would use it as a base for chemical production. If one looks at the Parliamentary Paper incorporating the main features of the Bechtel Pacific Corporation's report on these items, one finds what is needed. The heading "The South Australian Natural Gas Market" appears on page 3, and the report states:

A market survey carried out by the Department of Mines in collaboration with the producers, the South Australian Gas Company, the Electricity Trust of South Australia, and major industrial consumers of fuel, has indicated average daily volumes and peak day volumes of demand for natural gas as shown in table 3 of the attached Technical and Statistical Summary by Bechtel Pacific Corporation Ltd. This assumes, of course, that the gas is supplied at prices fully competitive with alternative fuels. No amounts are included in the table for any possible demands for natural gas for use other than as a fuel. That statement has a very significant ending. We come to some interesting statistics:

To meet these potential demands fully over a period of 20 years would require the delivery of about 1,750 billion cubic feet of gas, and to justify the development of consumers' plant to this capacity in 20 years' time would call for a further 3,500 billion cubic feet of gas over the following 20 years.

In other words, to justify the full completion of the Bechtel report as envisaged over a 20-year programme, a further 3,500 billion cubic feet of gas would be called for over the following 20 years. It is obvious that if this 20-year programme is implemented, it has to look forward for its amortization to the use of another 3,250 billion cubic feet of gas. The report continues:

This calculation is somewhat academic for it is unlikely, even if some 5,250 billion cubic feet of deliverable supplies were established, that facilities could be provided to meet fully such demands, including daily and seasonal peaks, without the normal supply devices of "peak-shaving" and "interruptible supplies contracts". But this calculation does show the very considerable extent of probable demand for natural gas as a fuel—

not as a chemical, but as a fuel— and moreover overseas experience has been that estimates made of future expansion in demand have been consistently conservative.

The report which we have been studying and which has been issued to the South Australian public shows that the total quantity of gas required would be 5,250 billion cubic feet. The quantity is the total reserve of gas. We would need 1,750 billion cubic feet of gas in 20 years' time. We need to develop that

quantity in a continuing process of keeping up with fuel supplies until we need 5,250 billion cubic feet. What have we got? According to the survey of the Mines Department we at present have 460 billion cubic feet at Gidgealpa. The pamphlet continues:

An assessment of natural gas reserves, based on the seven productive wells, indicates 460 billion cubic feet of pipeline gas at Gidgealpa, and 340 billion cubic feet at Moomba, though testing here is not complete. The combined reserves of the two fields are established at 800 billion cubic feet with probable reserves of about 1,440 billion cubic feet of natural gas.

Of course, the report and Parliamentary Paper draw attention to the fact that the recoverable supplies proved at present are 600 billion cubic feet. Not all of the 800 billion cubic feet is recoverable. To satisfy the expected demand for this gas, 1,750 billion cubic feet would be required before long. However, the present table of the supply of fuel shows that the present availability is about 600 billion cubic feet. That is a sobering thought when some of the claims that have been made about what this gas will do for South Australia are considered. Of course, gas would do many of the things claimed if we had it in the supply to which I referred, but at present we have not.

The most desirable form of finance is by long-term loan from the Commonwealth Government at the Government loan rate of interest. Of course, the Treasurer was not able to obtain such a loan, but South Australia needs it. We need to be conscious of the interest rates on the cost of the pipeline because of the costs of alternative fuels in South Australia. Fuel oil is a competitive seller. In other States, Governments are relying on semi-governmental authorities to supply their electricity from coal that is obtained cheaply. My figures show that coal at Newcastle costs the authority there 11c a million b.t.u. at the powerhouse door. At Yallourn and Morwell the cost is 12c. In Queensland the cost ranges from 10c to 17c, whereas at Leigh Creek it is about 21c to 23c, depending on which figures are used.

Mr. Quirke: What about Port Augusta?

Mr. HALL: At Port Augusta the cost is about 22c, which is twice the cost at Newcastle. We can substantiate bringing this gas to the metropolitan area only if it is used as fuel by the Electricity Trust. Although I do not know the intentions of the Western Australian Government, I believe we are probably the only State examining the possibility of using

natural gas for large scale electricity generation. A small article in this morning's *Advertiser* showed that Sir Henry Bolte would certainly not use it for power generation because the authority pays 12c at Yallourn and Morwell. If the report in the press is correct the unit price of gas in the metropolitan area there will be 30c. Therefore, there is no hope of bridging the cost factor for electricity generation in Victoria. Because of the low costs of alternative fuels in other States, it is unlikely that those States will bridge the cost factor also.

South Australia is in a particularly vulnerable position as it does not have a large use for gas that could substantiate a high purchase price. Perhaps that is the reason why there is no contract between the Electricity Trust and the producers of this gas. At present, we have a field which Parliamentary Paper 102 shows as having 600 billion cubic feet of gas. We have a report dealing with the main features and supplying what I believe is a sobering set of figures about what we can expect with the position as we know it today. On the financial side, we have what the Treasurer calls a verbal arrangement. In his second reading explanation, he said:

The full details of the Commonwealth's lending proposals have not yet been submitted to this Government in writing for acceptance, and in point of fact they have so far been limited to a verbal statement by the Prime Minister to the Premiers and to some preparatory discussions between the Commonwealth Treasury officers and the South Australian Under-Treasurer.

Mr. Hughes: I think you can accept the Prime Minister's word.

Mr. HALL: Yes, of course. The Treasurer said that he expected the finance would be arranged at about 5½ per cent interest. He said that the Commonwealth would act only in the capacity of a bridging financier and would provide finance only until we could arrange our own finance. In view of the gloomy report presented by the Minister of Works, representing the Treasurer, to the House today, we can be sure that funds will come not from the Government but from semi-governmental or private interests. The Commonwealth Government will act as a bridging financier until 1972 when we will be expected to begin the repayment of \$15,000,000 over a period of eight years. Parliamentary Paper 102 (which will undoubtedly be quoted extensively during this debate) states:

The early requirements calling for the present consideration and planning appear

therefore to be about \$35,000,000 of which \$31,000,000 will be required over the years 1967 and 1968, and the further \$4,000,000 probably spread over the next three years. In the light of probable necessity for subsequent extensions of facilities it would seem desirable not to make commitments for repayment of earlier borrowings to commence before about 1980.

This, supposed to be an expert report, is the only report available, and it states that it would seem desirable not to make commitments for repayment of earlier borrowings to commence before about 1980; it does not say that that definitely must not happen. The Treasurer has brought back to the House a verbal agreement that we will begin repayments in 1972. I submit that these eight years will be crucial years indeed in relation to the State's finances, the sum the State may receive from a return on royalties, and the reliability of the entire project. The authority will begin to repay capital before there have been any significantly useful years of the operation of the pipeline. I believe this is one of the most significant parts of the proposal brought back by the Treasurer.

Of course, as so much semi-governmental finance will be used, we must consider what alternative uses could have been made of this money. Although this is probably a good way to finance the pipeline if the money is available, I believe we should consider what uses could have been made of this money apart from supplying the needs of the pipeline authority. I approve of the legislation in the main, but I have not had time to study similar legislation in other parts of the world. I know that some of the powers of the authority are extreme. It has the right to acquire gas, but this is necessary because it is unlikely that it will want to buy gas for purposes other than its operation. The authority should not be hampered by insufficient power, but much will depend on how the legislation is administered. The report states that a decision is not required to be made about the feasibility of this scheme. If the legislation is passed it will be a Government decision as to when and where the pipeline will be built, and whether the project is feasible. This is not good enough.

We are considering an expenditure of about \$35,000,000 and, as the State Government and semi-governmental finances are involved, why is not the Public Works Committee asked to report on this project? Is the committee's reputation so bad that it should not consider this matter? This State is indebted to that committee for the valuable research it has done.

The Opposition's stand on this point is strengthened because the Treasurer will not divulge important details, so that one section only of the House will pass this measure because the Opposition have not been given these details. In that case, there is only one thing it can do. If the details are not available for the Opposition to consider, it must move that Parliament's watchdog should consider the whole project: no other course is open to it.

Mr. Hudson: How long do you think the Public Works Committee will take? Two years!

Mr. HALL: The project would not be delayed by an investigation.

Mr. Hudson: How long did the committee take on the Sturt River?

Mr. HALL: The report considers that 750 billion cubic feet of gas must be available before a substantial effort should be made to build a pipeline, but only 600 billion cubic feet of gas is known to be available. Between now and the effective start of building the pipeline an additional 150 billion cubic feet of gas has to be proven. However, the last attempt to prove it did not work at Moomba No. 3 well, which has turned out to be unsatisfactory. Obviously, there can be no substantial move to order pipes in the next three months, because all that can be done in that time is to attempt to prove the field. The Public Works Committee could effectively report on this matter within that time.

Mr. Shannon: The committee could be given all the information available to the Government now.

Mr. HALL: I accept the assurance of the Chairman of the committee that the investigation would be completed in weeks rather than months. The effective course to take would be to have the Public Works Committee review this project and, if that were done, the Opposition would be satisfied that the correct course had been taken. Many problems have to be overcome before the scheme can proceed. On page 4, under the heading "Size of Pipeline", the Parliamentary Paper states:

To meet fully the prospective market for gas as a fuel only, as it seems likely to develop over the next 20 years, would call for a 22in. pipeline in the first instance, followed by looping with a second 22in. pipeline commencing after eight years. Our present problem, however, is to tailor our programme to—

- (1) Established reserves of deliverable gas (by tender date) of at least 750 billion cubic feet.

- (2) The necessity to contemplate a minimum supply period of 20 years from the date of each progressive commitment of considerable capital funds.

These are the basic problems for the Government. The Parliamentary Paper, referring to the pricing of natural gas, states:

The most favourable price of alternative supplies for domestic gas in this State at present appears to be of the order of 42c to 45c a million British thermal units and this unit is practically the equivalent of the heat value in a thousand cubic feet (Mcf) of natural gas. The most favourable alternative fuel for industrial heating purposes at present costs approximately the equivalent of 30c to 32c a Mcf of natural gas, whilst for generation of electricity the most favourable alternative fuel can presently be secured on basis of very large volume contracts for the equivalent of about 26c to 27c a Mcf of natural gas. To meet without bettering these competitive prices on the basis of 55 per cent average load factor of assigned pipeline capacity for domestic gas, 75 per cent average load factor for industry, and 80 per cent average load factor for generation of electricity, and allowing for the probable relative proportions of these three categories of demand in total sales, the average price would be about 30c a Mcf delivered from the pipeline. To give a competitive margin on a commercial basis perhaps an average price of 29c could be contemplated.

Later, the report states:

In this connection it is pointed out that, whilst there seems to be good prospects of reducing the fuel cost for generation of electricity in Adelaide by some 20 per cent below the present cost of the most favourably priced alternative fuel and thereby bringing it into line with the fuel cost using Leigh Creek coal at Port Augusta, this can only be done provided that the transportation costs can be kept to a minimum by the availability of finance at the lowest practicable interest rates.

Here we are referring to the Leigh Creek coal-field price, which is about 22c. This is the basic difference between the usage of gas in South Australia and the usage in the other States. We have to get the price down to a figure far below that quoted for Victoria. If this morning's report that a figure of 30c has been agreed on for the price of gas to the metropolitan area of Melbourne is correct (and I believe it is), then it is completely out of the question for South Australia: we have to do significantly better than that if natural gas is to be used at all in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. One of the big questions is whether we can do better.

Mr. Hudson: We can!

Mr. HALL: I think we must do better, otherwise the producers get nothing and we get nothing down here.

Mr. Hudson: We must and we can do better!

Mr. Clark: We have to, obviously.

Mr. HALL: The member for Gawler is correct. We are all agreed that we have to shave very significantly the price of 30c, which is the figure in Melbourne. It has to be shown that this can be done.

Mr. Shannon: Whether or not it could be done would be obvious if we had the evidence.

Mr. HALL: Yes; if it is obvious, why can we not be shown?

Mr. Quirke: It is only assumed.

Mr. HALL: Yes. If it is proved that there are large quantities of gas in or near the Gidgealpa-Moomba field, we will want to increase the pipeline capacity.

Mr. Coumbe: By loops.

Mr. HALL: Yes, and by various other means. The only thing we have to go on is the Bechtel report. To do this, we would need considerable finance on a continuing basis into the distant future. At the same time, we would need large sums when we began to repay the finance in 1972. This is one of the disquieting things that has come out of the Treasurer's report to this House. Although we look forward to finding more gas so that we can increase the supply, not only do we have to start paying back in 1972, but we also have to find huge sums that will fairly soon dwarf our initial expenditure of \$31,000,000 to \$35,000,000.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Which may not be available on favourable terms.

Mr. HALL: That is so. It is significant that the Loan Council approval for borrowing in this matter terminates in 1972, but when the State will again have to approach the Loan Council. The member for Glenelg shakes his head; he disagrees with his Leader, and not for the first time, either. For the honourable member's benefit I will quote the Treasurer's speech on introducing this measure. He said:

As a consequence of this advice, the Commonwealth agreed to support a State application to the Australian Loan Council, for a borrowing authority over the period ending June 30, 1972, of \$20,000,000 for the purpose.

That is remarkably concise.

Mr. Hudson: After that, it would be converted to semi-governmental borrowing.

Mr. HALL: For which we must have Loan Council permission. That is exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. Hudson: The Loan Council permission flows from its original approval.

Mr. HALL: Nonsense; the approval ends in 1972, and its extension is not automatic.

Mr. Hudson: It is obvious.

Mr. HALL: Nothing is obvious.

Mr. Hudson: It cannot possibly work any other way.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are having as much to say as the Leader of the Opposition, and I ask them not to keep interjecting.

Mr. HALL: The member for Glenelg knows that, if we could take for granted the continuation of financial agreements that have a definite termination period, the finances of Australia between Government and Government would be in a chaotic state. I should like to think we would get permission to repay the Commonwealth from further semi-governmental borrowings.

Mr. Hudson: It is already implicit in the whole agreement.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer says he has only a verbal agreement. Does the member for Glenelg have the agreement, or has he seen it?

Mr. Hudson: Read the Treasurer's second reading explanation.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Treasurer says it is only verbal.

Mr. HALL: I know that I have often criticized the Treasurer, but in this matter I intend to take his word, not that of the member for Glenelg. The Treasurer says that the agreement is verbal, and that it ends in 1972. When we go back to the Loan Council at that time and ask permission to borrow \$15,000,000 to pay back the Commonwealth bridging finance, we will also have to ask—if we find more gas—for a greatly increased sum in the ensuing years to build the facilities. This is the disquieting thing that is referred to in the Parliamentary Paper. Obviously, we should not start repayments until 1980, yet according to the Treasurer's verbal agreement we are expected to start repaying in 1972.

Mr. Hudson: By substituting semi-governmental borrowings for the Loan Council borrowings.

Mr. HALL: I can no longer wait for the member for Glenelg to catch up.

Mr. Clark: What he is telling you is the truth.

Mr. HALL: During the public consideration of this pipeline authority and the possible physical construction of the pipeline, a question has arisen regarding whether or not the pipeline should take the eastern route (the most direct route to the metropolitan area) or whether it should take the western route and deviate to the extent of an increase in length of some 30 miles and thereby more easily serve the northern industrial cities of Port

Augusta, Whyalla and Port Pirie. This has developed to the extent that several submissions have been made to the Minister of Mines and to the Government. Some people consider that perhaps in the interests of decentralization the Government should make a conscious effort to bring this pipeline down through the Gulf areas. I have publicly stated that I should like to see the costing of these two alternative routes.

I believe the Government has more information about this western route than it will divulge to the House or the public. I believe that the Bechtel Corporation has seen fit to give the Government further information, which is not contained in Parliamentary Paper 102 or in any other public document, concerning the costing of the western route which would, if adopted, bring gas to the three northern towns. I have asked the Treasurer for all the Bechtel reports, but these have been refused. We have only three or four significant reports to go on. One of them is an answer to a question that the Treasurer gave in this House to the member for Gumeracha last year, when he stated that the extra cost of bringing the pipeline on the western route would be \$2,600,000, a figure that I understand he would be unable to substantiate except by drawing a line on the map and estimating the increased cost of the actual pipe, because the Bechtel report that we are able to get does not mention costing on the western route.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It has never been surveyed.

Mr. HALL: No. A number of people have raised this matter. Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited through one of its officers placed its submission before the Minister of Mines about the western route. It was a well-constructed statement that I believe has narrowed the gap in information caused by the Government's non-co-operation in this matter. I quote from this B.H.A.S. report to the Minister of Mines about a possible alternative western route for this proposed pipeline:

In expressing these views, we do so, not merely in the interests of B.H.A.S. and Port Pirie but in the interests of all who are concerned with achieving the maximum benefits to the State from natural gas development.

The report continues later:

It is our considered opinion that markets for substantial quantities of gas can only be established in areas where the price is competitive. The gas producer and the pipeline authority must be prepared to make gas available at prices similar to those which will apply in Adelaide if industry based on gas is to be developed in areas away from Adelaide. If an

industrial consumer has to bear the additional capital charges associated with long and costly branch lines, no substantial demand will ever be created in such areas. To encourage decentralization, the Government would have to be prepared to grant concessions in some form or other. If we consider the case of the proposed anhydrous ammonia plant at Wallaroo which it has been reported would require from 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 cubic feet of gas per day—

I am assured privately that it would be just under 10,000,000 cubic feet—

if the main pipeline route via Peterborough and Clare is followed, supply to Wallaroo would require a branch line, estimated to be 65-70 miles. To supply a maximum of 10,000,000 cubic feet a day over this distance would, we estimate, require an 8-in. pipeline at a capital cost of \$2,000,000. Capital amortization and interest at 5½ per cent over 20 years would require a capital charge of \$167,000 per annum. On an initial 5,000,000 cubic feet of gas per day, this would represent an additional transport cost of 5.1c/1,000 cubic feet or \$2 a ton of ammonia. At the maximum rate of 10,000,000 cubic feet/day it would still represent \$1 a ton of ammonia. Either figure would present a difficulty to such an industry establishing itself at Wallaroo rather than at Adelaide. A similar consideration would apply to any other branch line of comparable length, but capital charges per 1,000 cubic feet of gas would be much greater for a smaller daily capacity.

Later, the report continues:

From the strictly limited viewpoint of initial capital requirements this may be true.

This is referring to the assertion that a branch line may be more economic. The report continues:

We venture to suggest that if the gas to be supplied through such a branch line has to bear an additional cost of 10c or more per 1,000 cubic feet, there is never likely to be a demand for it for industrial purposes. Such a burden would perpetuate a handicap to industrial expansion in places other than the metropolitan area. We believe decentralization should be encouraged by the Government rather than discouraged. Numerous references have been made publicly to the fact that a pipeline via Port Augusta and Port Pirie would be 30 miles longer and would cost an additional \$2,600,000 including a second compressor station on this longer route. If a route some 30 miles longer would require an additional compressor station, it would appear to us that the shorter pipeline being considered with one compressor station would have very little scope to meet expanded demand in Adelaide. In fact we should think that the longer route with two compressor stations would have the greater gas carrying capacity. The question of carrying capacity of the two alternative lines should, we feel, be taken into account, as there is no doubt at all that, whenever natural gas is made available, the initial demand is very soon exceeded. By

adopting the shortest route to Adelaide we understand that an average daily load of about 77,000,000 cubic feet could be transported for 9½c per 1,000 cubic feet. Demand beyond this daily figure would then, we assume, require the installation of an additional compressor, involving about \$900,000 capital.

The report summarizes the position as follows:

To summarize, we feel that there are two crucial questions to be considered in choosing which pipeline route should be adopted:

- (a) Whether the spur lines necessary to supply gas from the shorter pipeline to the Spencer Gulf industrial towns would cause the price of gas to industries in those towns to rise beyond the point at which gas could ever be an economical proposition, and this would be so if the additional capital required for the spur lines were costed directly to the additional demand.
- (b) Whether sufficient account has been taken of the fact that, although a second compressor would be required on the longer line, a significant increase in gas carrying capacity would therefore result.

The corollary is that the direct route to Adelaide with one compressor would be overloaded almost at the beginning and we would need a second compressor soon after it came into operation. Thus, the figure of \$2,600,000 falls to \$1,700,000 almost immediately. For all practical purposes the figures supplied to the Treasurer fall, therefore, to \$1,700,000.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: And the throughput on the pipeline would probably wipe it out altogether.

Mr. HALL: I have not finished. That is probably true. The Port Augusta Chamber of Commerce Incorporated has made submissions which I think most members of Parliament have seen. They contain good material.

Mr. Hurst: Where?

Mr. HALL: I do not know whether the honourable member has read any of this yet; I doubt whether he has.

Mr. Hurst: Ask questions and they cannot answer!

Mr. Hughes: Have the extracts been sent to members?

Mr. HALL: I should think so. I can understand the honourable member's interest in this matter. I am doing my best to try to get gas to Wallaroo. If the member for Wallaroo would appreciate that, he would join in this move, but he has not been very vocal in this matter. If he expects Wallaroo to be able to stand the extra cost of 10c for each 1,000 cubic feet as outlined in the B.H.A.S. report, he must have some lucrative industries there.

There will be an immediate demand for 9,800,000 cubic feet of gas for Wallaroo as soon as it is available, as soon as the line can be built.

Mr. Hughes: We have it all worked out.

Mr. HALL: Apparently Wallaroo will have to wait. The Treasurer keeps on saying that the final route has not been chosen, but almost inevitably it will be the shortest one.

Mr. Hughes: Don't worry about Wallaroo. We have looked after that.

Mr. HALL: The report states:

The Government's intention, however, is to tailor the capital expenditure and pipeline size to suit:

- (1) The proven deliverable reserves at the time (in the first instance 750 billion cubic feet).
- (2) The need to provide a supply for a minimum period of 20 years.
- (3) The desire to render each stage of the development economically independent of further development and expenditure.

By adopting this approach it is able to keep the initial capital required to a minimum, and to finance subsequent development from the recoveries of operation. This is a purely businesslike approach in which a full return is assured at minimum risk. It will result in the pipeline's being developed in a number of stages each based on assured reserves and demand.

Such an approach does not permit expenditure on pipeline to possible areas of demand which might eventually become economic for gas which might be available. In other words, it is concerned with a "no profit—no loss" business of gas transportation without any ingredient of market development or State development other than in the city. Consequently, the cheapest pipeline routes are the only ones which are contemplated.

The summary states:

The pertinent factors which flow from the foregoing study are:

- (1) The proposed alternative routes incur only relatively small estimated increases in capital costs—so small that they could be reckoned less than the margin of error likely in preparing such preliminary estimates.
- (2) The resulting increased unit cost of transportation, although probably not insignificant in itself, will probably be so when related to the cost of the gas to the consumer.

Say, $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ cents in 30 to 40 cents for each 1,000 cubic feet.

I believe that that, translated to a percentage, is between .8 and 1.25 in the cost of the gas in these Gulf towns and in the metropolitan area, which is a significant factor. Looking at Parliamentary Paper 102, we find an interesting break-down in the cost of \$31,000,000. The cost of installing the pipeline is listed on page

15 at \$6,713,000, or 21.5 per cent of the entire initial cost of the pipeline. Engineering and contingencies, etc., are listed at \$6,188,000, or 20 per cent of the entire initial cost, both factors representing 41.5 per cent of the total initial cost. If such a high proportion of the total cost of the pipeline is involved in contingencies, engineering and installation, the type of terrain to be traversed by the pipeline has a great bearing on the final cost. Has the Government costed the alternative western route? Has it firm figures, to compare with the Bechtel report's recommended eastern route? If it has, has it taken fully into account the more difficult terrain involved in the eastern route, and the far more favourable facilities available on the western route?

If, as some people have suggested, because of the type of terrain, the easier transport and the cost of contingencies, engineering and installation, the two routes involved the same costs, which way would the Government recommend the pipeline to come? I think common sense would dictate that if the two routes were to cost the same the Government would bring the pipeline down through the gulf towns. It is up to the Government, however, to ascertain whether the routes will cost the same. It would be a great blow to decentralization and to South Australia's future generally if the Government were to proceed, without knowing all the final facts about the alternative route.

Mr. McKee: Which way do you think private enterprise would bring the pipeline, if it had to?

Mr. HALL: It is members like the member for Port Pirie would should be looking deeply into this matter.

Mr. McKee: I have.

Mr. HALL: Does the honourable member know the relative costs of these two routes?

Mr. McKee: I have been more concerned about it than you have.

Mr. HALL: Let us not be emotional about this matter. We have seen too much emotional legislation in the last couple of years. Does the member for Port Pirie know the answer to my question?

Mr. McKee: I know more about it than you do.

Mr. HALL: We have pleaded with the Government to tell us the facts. What is the member for Port Pirie covering up?

Mr. Hughes: You must have received plenty of information, because you have been reading from reports all afternoon.

Mr. HALL: When the House meets next Tuesday I will again ask the Treasurer to reveal the figures that he has revealed to the member for Port Pirie.

Mr. Nankivell: And to the members for Wallaroo and Glenelg!

Mr. HALL: Yes. We do not want a second-rate decision.

Mr. Hughes: I challenge you to tell us what figures have been revealed to us!

Mr. HALL: I do not wish to impugn the veracity of the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. Clark: You have already done that in respect of the Treasurer. Be honest about the matter. You have been telling truths and half truths.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The member for Port Pirie has said that he knows the figures.

Mr. Hughes: Then I was out of the Chamber when he said that.

Mr. McKee: I said I knew more about it than you.

Mr. HALL: His colleagues are doing their best to protect him.

Mr. Clark: It is all right to call the Treasurer a liar. He is not here, but we are.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not know whether I have been heard or not, but I have called honourable members to order several times, and I expect them to obey those calls to order. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition!

Mr. HALL: I can hear you, Sir, and I am pleased to receive your protection. It has been demonstrated that we are not in possession of sufficient facts about the matter. I should like the many questions that are involved to be answered. Unfortunately, the Treasurer could not supply the information in respect of some of the questions that have been asked. We do not know how much gas is available, although we do know that there is a base figure, as well as it can be estimated by the experts. How many risks can the State take in building this pipeline? How much should the pipeline cost? What element of risk should be involved in siting the pipeline? When do we want the gas? The Treasurer says we want it in 1969. However, the last authoritative word I can find on the subject is in the 1965 report of the Electricity Trust, which states:

It will not be convenient for the trust to use natural gas before 1970. The first two boilers for Torrens Island will be commissioned in 1967 and 1968 as oil-fired boilers. These two boilers were ordered in mid-1963. They have been designed as oil-fired boilers capable of being converted to burn oil and gas, anticipat-

ing the possibility that a large supply of natural gas will eventually become available to the trust. The trust will not have sufficient surplus boiler capacity until about 1970 to enable one of the large Torrens Island boilers to be taken out of service for the major additions necessary to enable it to burn natural gas.

Of course, the Treasurer may have a later report than this, but it is the latest report that I have been able to find. From that report, it appears that sufficient capacity will not be available until the latter part of 1970, which will be the hotter months. Can we go against the advice in Parliamentary Paper No. 102, which states that repayment of the finance should not be commenced before 1980? I am not saying that we cannot commence repayments earlier than that: I am asking whether we can. Why have we been denied information? What are the relative costs of the eastern and western routes? What should the Electricity Trust pay for gas and what could it afford to pay? Will there be any guarantee when the agreements are reached that the industrial section of the community will receive a cost benefit? Will electricity prices be maintained at the present level, or will they increase or decrease? The Treasurer cannot or will not answer many of these questions, and I believe it is most essential (it is certainly essential to the Opposition) to have them answered.

This matter is most complicated and there is a lack of information. Therefore, it is essential that the whole matter should be fully considered by an expert committee. Only one committee is set up to report to the Government effectively and in such a way that the initial date of delivery of the gas, as required by the Electricity Trust, will not be affected, and that is the Public Works Committee. At the appropriate time, I will move that this matter be referred to the Public Works Committee, which has been used similarly on many other important projects. I have raised these points and I believe it is up to the Government to endeavour to answer many of them. Of course, the Opposition supports the Government in establishing this authority and it supports the Bill before the House.

Mr. McKee: You have your tongue in your cheek now; you have done everything you can to hinder the Bill.

Mr. HALL: One more step that seems necessary before the Bill is passed and the authority is set up is to have the information that comes from the field and that which comes from the Commonwealth about finance. When

these two matters have been finalized the authority can be inaugurated. We hope there will be unlimited supplies of gas some day when it is needed, and that it will be available to the metropolitan area and to country areas in South Australia. When the matter has been fully debated and when the full facts the Government has are made available to the Opposition, I believe we will all be much

clearer on the matter. I support the Bill, but I shall move an amendment at the appropriate stage.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 7, at 2 p.m.